

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Cloey Romans	Team: Squad #07	CCRB Case #: 202207506	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 11/05/2022 6:25 PM	Location of Incident: 62nd Precinct stationhouse	18 Mo. SOL 5/5/2024	Precinct: 62		
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 11/05/2022 10:58 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sat, 11/05/2022 10:58 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. PO Frank Schimmenti	29028	967327	062 PCT
2. LT Colbert Martin	00000	925674	062 PCT
3. An officer			

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.LT Colbert Martin	Abuse: Lieutenant Colbert Martin issued a retaliatory summons to § 87(2)(b)	
B.LT Colbert Martin	Abuse: Lieutenant Colbert Martin interfered with § 87(2)(b) use of a recording device.	
C.LT Colbert Martin	Abuse: Lieutenant Colbert Martin improperly used his body-worn camera.	
D.PO Frank Schimmenti	Abuse: Police Officer Frank Schimmenti failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
E. An officer	Abuse: An officer refused to provide their name to § 87(2)(b)	
F. An officer	Abuse: An officer refused to provide their shield number to § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On November 5, 2022, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via their Online Website.

At approximately 6:25 p.m. on November 5, 2022, § 87(2)(b) walked into the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse, Brooklyn, to make a video recording on his cell phone. Upon entering, § 87(2)(b) was directed by Lieutenant Colbert Martin of the 62nd Precinct that he could not record inside the stationhouse and needed to leave. § 87(2)(b) continued recording but exited the building. § 87(2)(b) began recording the exterior of the stationhouse, including Lt. Martin's vehicle which was parked in front of the building. Approximately two minutes after § 87(2)(b) exited the stationhouse, Lt. Martin and Police Officer Frank Schimmenti of the 62nd Precinct approached § 87(2)(b) and placed him under arrest for trespassing (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). While placing § 87(2)(b) into handcuffs, Lt. Martin directed PO Schimmenti to stop § 87(2)(b) cell phone video recording (**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) was taken back inside the stationhouse where PO Schimmenti processed him for arrest and Lt. Martin observed. § 87(2)(b) requested that Lt. Martin activate his BWC, which Lt. Martin refused to do (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) was lodged into a holding cell while PO Schimmenti prepared a summons. Upon § 87(2)(b) release, he requested PO Schimmenti's business card and PO Schimmenti declined to provide one because his information was on § 87(2)(b) summons (**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) left the stationhouse and had no further interaction with officers. No additional arrests or summons were issued.

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that while being processed for release inside the stationhouse, he requested the name and shield number of an additional officer (**Allegations E and F: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)).

Four Body-worn Camera (BWC) videos were yielded, including two for PO Schimmenti and zero for Lt. Martin (Board Review 01 through 04). Stationhouse footage was obtained from the exterior of the building and the interior lobby of the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse (Board Review 05 and 06).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Lieutenant Colbert Martin issued a retaliatory summons to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Lieutenant Colbert Martin interfered with § 87(2)(b) use of a recording device.

§ 87(2)(b) went to the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse to make a video recording on his phone. § 87(2)(b) recorded the exterior of the building for approximately one minute, then entered the stationhouse through the main door and continued recording on his cell phone. Upon entering the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) observed PO Schimmenti speaking on the phone and an unknown female civilian standing nearby him. § 87(2)(b) stood in the vestibule of the stationhouse, in front of a gate that sectioned off the secured portion of the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) continued filming the inside of the stationhouse, standing in the public portion of the lobby. PO Schimmenti approached § 87(2)(b) and informed him that he was not permitted to film inside the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Schimmenti if that was an NYPD policy and told PO Schimmenti that the stationhouse was a public building. PO Schimmenti directed § 87(2)(b) attention to a poster on the wall near where § 87(2)(b) was standing. The poster stated that filming was not allowed in the stationhouse. PO Schimmenti again verbally informed § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) that he was not allowed to film inside the stationhouse. Lt. Martin then approached § 87(2)(b) and PO Schimmenti. Lt. Martin told § 87(2)(b) that he needed to leave the building. § 87(2)(b) asked Lt. Martin if this directive was “a lawful order” and Lt. Martin stated that it was, and that § 87(2)(b) needed to stop recording and leave the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) apologized and exited the building. PO Schimmenti walked outside with § 87(2)(b). Once § 87(2)(b) was on the sidewalk outside the stationhouse, PO Schimmenti went back inside. § 87(2)(b) continued filming, from the exterior of the stationhouse, walking on the sidewalk in front of the building. § 87(2)(b) recorded a vehicle that was parked in a space designated for a lieutenant, which § 87(2)(b) believed to be Lt. Martin’s vehicle. Lt. Martin immediately approached § 87(2)(b) and told him that if he wanted to record, he had to go across the street to do so. § 87(2)(b) began stepping backward when Lt. Martin grabbed § 87(2)(b) left arm and pulled it behind his back. PO Schimmenti grabbed § 87(2)(b) phone out of his right hand, turned off the recording, then grabbed § 87(2)(b) right arm and pulled it behind his back. § 87(2)(b) was placed into handcuffs and taken back inside the stationhouse (Board Review 07).

PO Schimmenti stated that he was working as Stationhouse Security when he observed § 87(2)(b) enter through the front door of the stationhouse, holding a cell phone and making a video recording. At the time that § 87(2)(b) entered, PO Schimmenti was interviewing a child abuse victim near the front entrance of the interior stationhouse. PO Schimmenti asked § 87(2)(b) if he could help him with anything and § 87(2)(b) told PO Schimmenti that he was just ‘making a film for my friends and family.’ PO Schimmenti told § 87(2)(b) that he cannot film in the stationhouse and pointed to a sign posted in the entrance vestibule near § 87(2)(b) that states filming is prohibited inside the stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) told PO Schimmenti that it’s ‘just a policy’ and continued filming. Approximately two minutes had elapsed since § 87(2)(b) entered the stationhouse and began speaking with PO Schimmenti, when Lt. Martin approached. PO Schimmenti and Lt. Martin provided consistent testimony that Lt. Martin requested § 87(2)(b) stop filming and § 87(2)(b) continued filming. Lt. Martin then directed § 87(2)(b) that if he was not going to stop filming, he needed to exit the stationhouse, which § 87(2)(b) complied with by walking backward out of the stationhouse but continuing to record while doing so. PO Schimmenti walked out of the stationhouse with § 87(2)(b) and informed him that he could record outside of the stationhouse but not inside, and PO Schimmenti then reentered the stationhouse alone. PO Schimmenti believed § 87(2)(b) continued to film outside the stationhouse, but stated this was not prohibited and that PO Schimmenti took no issue with § 87(2)(b) filming outside of the building. § 87(2)(b) began to film police vehicles that were parked outside the stationhouse, including Lt. Martin’s vehicle. PO Schimmenti denied recalling how he learned § 87(2)(b) was outside filming vehicles.

Lt. Martin stated that after § 87(2)(b) exited the building, Lt. Martin was informed by an unknown officer that § 87(2)(b) was Live Streaming outside. Lt. Martin denied recalling which officer informed him of this and stated that Live Streaming did not have any more significance than a regular video recording. Lt. Martin exited the stationhouse to arrest § 87(2)(b) and PO Schimmenti followed behind him. PO Schimmenti stated that at the time he followed Lt. Martin out of the stationhouse, he did not know Lt. Martin’s purpose for approaching § 87(2)(b). Lt. Martin stated he went outside with the intention of arresting § 87(2)(b) for trespassing, which is a determination he made when he learned § 87(2)(b) was Live Streaming outside. Lt. Martin stated this determination was made partially because § 87(2)(b) had filmed the child abuse victim when he was initially inside the stationhouse and because § 87(2)(b) had “ignored all lawful orders to stop filming” while inside the stationhouse. Lt. Martin stated the reason that § 87(2)(b) was not arrested while inside the stationhouse filming is because Lt. Martin “used discretion,” but Lt. Martin was unable to elaborate on what this meant. Upon approaching § 87(2)(b) outside the building when he was filming, Lt. Martin grabbed § 87(2)(b) left arm and pulled it behind his back to place him into handcuffs. Seeing that Lt.

Martin was effecting an arrest, PO Schimmenti grabbed § 87(2)(b) cell phone out of his right hand and pulled § 87(2)(b) right arm behind his back to finish handcuffing § 87(2)(b). PO Schimmenti stated that he did not know why § 87(2)(b) was being placed under arrest and was not informed by Lt. Martin why § 87(2)(b) was being arrested, and that PO Schimmenti assisted in effecting the arrest because Lt. Martin initiated the process with him there. Lt. Martin was shown stationhouse footage which captured § 87(2)(b) filming Lt. Martin's vehicle immediately before being placed under arrest and Lt. Martin denied that the filming of his vehicle played into the determination to arrest § 87(2)(b). Lt. Martin confirmed that § 87(2)(b) is lawfully allowed to film outside the stationhouse and that the determination to arrest § 87(2)(b) for trespassing was based upon his time filming inside the stationhouse and not his actions after he left the stationhouse. After placing § 87(2)(b) into handcuffs, he was brought inside the stationhouse. PO Schimmenti began processing § 87(2)(b) for arrest but was still unaware of what he was being arrested for. It was not until § 87(2)(b) was lodged into a holding cell and PO Schimmenti returned to the desk that he was informed by Lt. Martin to prepare a summons for § 87(2)(b) for trespassing. PO Schimmenti denied knowing of any arrestable offense § 87(2)(b) had committed prior to being informed by Lt. Martin to prepare a summons for Trespass (Board Review 08 and 09).

Cell phone video recorded by § 87(2)(b) captures him approaching the 62nd Precinct stationhouse and filming the exterior of the building for approximately 1 minute and 16 seconds before entering. § 87(2)(b) walks into the building, where a woman and teen can be seen standing near the front interior entrance but are not speaking with any officer (beginning at the 01:16 time stamp). When § 87(2)(b) enters, he stands in the front vestibule portion and records the public portion of the facility for approximately 41 seconds before an officer, who is behind a desk near the front vestibule, asks, "Can I help you?" (at the 01:57 time stamp). § 87(2)(b) says, "No, I don't need no help. I'm just taking some pictures." PO Schimmenti approaches § 87(2)(b) and says, "Can I help you? You're not allowed to film in here, okay?" and points to an orange sign posted on the wall which says, "Members of the public are prohibited from audio video recording or photography inside this facility" (at the 02:10 time stamp). § 87(2)(b) responds, "This is not a public place? This is not a public building?" PO Schimmenti says, "It's not public, it's a police station. Are you good now? You can go now." § 87(2)(b) responds, "Why should I go, are you the sergeant?" § 87(2)(b) requests PO Schimmenti's name and badge number, to which he replies, "PO Schimmenti, 29028" (at the 02:46 time stamp). § 87(2)(b) asks, "So am I being kicked out of a public building?" and Lt. Martin approaches from behind the desk and says, "Actually sir, there's no filming in the building. Turn the camera off now." § 87(2)(b) responds, "Alright, I'm sorry. I'll walk out. Is a lawful order?" Lt. Martin responds, "Yes, turn the camera off now." § 87(2)(b) immediately turns around and says, "I'll leave right now. No problem. I'll leave, okay? I'm sorry. I just figured it's a public building, I'm allowed to record. Okay." § 87(2)(b) walks out of the stationhouse approximately 16 seconds after first being approached by Lt. Martin (beginning at the 02:57 time stamp). After exiting the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) and PO Schimmenti have a brief exchange about what constitutes a public building, then § 87(2)(b) walks away from the entrance and begins filming the exterior of the stationhouse, including police vehicles and the exterior signage. Approximately one and a half minutes after exiting the stationhouse, at the 4:48 time stamp, § 87(2)(b) approaches a gray sedan and walks around the exterior of the vehicle, and says, "I'm assuming this is the Lieutenant's car since it says 'lieutenant.' He drives a Honda." § 87(2)(b) angles the video recording towards the license plate of the vehicle and immediately Lt. Martin can be heard saying, "You want to film, go across the street and film. You are not allowed to film, go across the street and film. Right now" (at the 05:15 time stamp). Based on the vantage of the recording, it can be seen that § 87(2)(b) is backing away from Lt. Martin as Lt. Martin approaches § 87(2)(b) at close proximity. Lt. Martin says twice, "Turn it off." § 87(2)(b) asks, "Are you giving me a lawful order? Why are

you coming at me?” and continues backing up. Lt. Martin then appears to go behind § 87(2)(b) and begin effecting an arrest. PO Schimmenti approaches and Lt. Martin can be heard saying, “Shut it off, shut it off.” § 87(2)(b) asks, “Am I being detained right now?” and Lt. Martin responds, “Yes, you’re being detained” and then the video recording stops (Board Review 10).

Stationhouse footage of the interior lobby and vestibule of the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse captures § 87(2)(b) entering the stationhouse with his cell phone lifted in his right hand and he appears to be making a video recording (beginning at the 25:28 time stamp). A woman and teen can be seen standing near the front door, and § 87(2)(b) walks directly past them without stopping. Once inside the public vestibule, § 87(2)(b) is approached by PO Schimmenti (beginning at the 26:10 time stamp). PO Schimmenti points to a sign on the wall and § 87(2)(b) records it. § 87(2)(b) begins backing up and appears to start in the direction of the exit when at the 27:08 time stamp, Lt. Martin appears off camera and § 87(2)(b) leaves seven seconds after at the 27:15 time stamp. PO Schimmenti and Lt. Martin follow § 87(2)(b) outside then immediately reenter the stationhouse. Lt. Martin exits out of camera view and PO Schimmenti speaks to the woman and teen originally seen near the entrance. At the 29:09 time stamp, Lt. Martin reappears on camera walks directly through the lobby and exits the stationhouse. Lt. Martin does not appear to say anything to PO Schimmenti as he passes him. PO Schimmenti follows behind Lt. Martin and approximately one minute later, at the 30:07 time stamp, § 87(2)(b) is brought back into the stationhouse in rear handcuffs and being led by Lt. Martin. § 87(2)(b) is not seen again in this portion of the stationhouse footage (Board Review 06). Stationhouse footage which captures the exterior of the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse captures § 87(2)(b) walking on the sidewalk outside the stationhouse and filming the signage and surroundings, beginning at the 28:59 time stamp. § 87(2)(b) walks the perimeter of a gray Honda and films the vehicle. At the 29:27 time stamp, Lt. Martin appears and immediately approaches § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) walks backward as Lt. Martin approaches. A brief conversation appears to take place and at the 29:38 time stamp, Lt. Martin grabs § 87(2)(b) left arm and pulls it behind his back. PO Schimmenti approaches, removes § 87(2)(b) cell phone from his right hand, then assists in handcuffing § 87(2)(b). Lt. Martin is seen leading § 87(2)(b) back inside the stationhouse (Board Review 05).

BWC video from PO Schimmenti captures Lt. Martin approaching § 87(2)(b) outside of the stationhouse, pulling § 87(2)(b) left arm behind his back, and then Lt. Martin grabs for § 87(2)(b) cellphone (at the 00:17 time stamp). With Lt. Martin unable to reach the cell phone, PO Schimmenti removes it from § 87(2)(b) hand and assists in placing § 87(2)(b) into handcuffs. Lt. Martin then leads § 87(2)(b) into the stationhouse, where he is processed for arrest. At the 02:15 time stamp, Lt. Martin asks § 87(2)(b) “Why are you recording our cars around the precinct?” § 87(2)(b) responds, “Cause I’m working on a story, sir. I’m just doing my first amendment.” Lt. Martin asks, “Were you told to go across the street?” and § 87(2)(b) says, “When you went outside and rushed me? [...] I didn’t even have time to cross the street.” PO Schimmenti vouchers § 87(2)(b) property and lodges him in a holding cell (Board Review 01).

§ 87(2)(b) received a summons for Trespass, in violation of Penal Law 140.05, which was prepared by PO Schimmenti (Board Review 11).

New York Penal Law § 140.05 defines a person as guilty of Trespass when they knowingly enter or remain unlawfully in or upon premises (Board Review 19). NY CLS Penal Law § 240.00, which outlines Offenses against public order, and *People v Johnson*, 51 Misc. 3d 801, define a “public place” as a place to which the public or a substantial group of persons has access, and includes, but is not limited to, streets and sidewalks (Board Review 20 and 21).

The New York City Police Department Disciplinary System and Penalty Guidelines notes in regard to Abuse of Authority, that because of the trust placed in members of the NYPD and, the discretion and authority granted to members of the service, the community has every right to expect and demand the highest level of accountability from the Department, as well as from individual members of service. The guidelines note that misconduct includes abuse of enforcement action such as an arrest or summons for which there is a lawful basis, however, but for the officer's improper motive, enforcement action would not have been taken (Board Review 18).

NYC Administrative Guide 304-21 details the procedure for when a member of the service encounters an individual observing, photographing, and/or recording police activity. Members of the service are prohibited from intentionally preventing, or attempting to prevent, an individual from recording police activities and prohibited from commanding an individual to cease recording when an individual is authorized to do so under law. Members of the service are strictly prohibited from stopping, seizing, searching, summoning, or arresting an individual solely because such individual recorded police activities (Board Review 23).

§ 87(2)(g)

When Lt. Martin told him to leave the stationhouse, he complied. Approximately two minutes after § 87(2)(b) exited the stationhouse, while he was on a public sidewalk, he started recording Lt. Martin's vehicle. It was at this moment that Lt. Martin exited the stationhouse, told § 87(2)(b) that he had to go across the street to film, and then arrested him for trespass. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Lieutenant Colbert Martin improperly used his body-worn camera.

Once inside the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) requested that Lt. Martin and PO Schimmenti activate their BWCs. PO Schimmenti did so, whereas Lt. Martin was not wearing a BWC and told § 87(2)(b) that he did not need one (Board Review 07).

Lt. Martin confirmed that while inside the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) requested that Lt. Martin turn on his BWC. Lt. Martin did not do so because he was not wearing one and it was "his understanding" that while in the stationhouse, assigned as the Desk Officer, he was not required to activate his BWC. Lt. Martin stated that his BWC was behind the desk with him, but not attached to his body, when § 87(2)(b) made this request (Board Review 09).

No BWC video was yielded for Lt. Martin (Board Review 22).

According to NYPD Patrol Guide 212-123, an officer is required to activate their BWC prior to engaging in any police action and to record any interactions that escalate to become adversarial or may hold evidentiary value. Performance of administrative duties or non-enforcement functions, routine activities within Department facilities, and Departmental meetings or training are not considered police actions. Uniformed members of the service performing duty as desk officers, telephone switchboard operators, and stationhouse security are required to wear their BWC while performing duty (Board Review 12).

Lt. Martin and PO Schimmenti both testified that Lt. Martin determined to arrest § 87(2)(b) and

initiated the process when he approached § 87(2)(b) outside; this is indisputably a police action. In addition, this enforcement action took place with an individual who Lt. Martin had already interacted with and was deemed adversarial. § 87(2)(g)

Despite Lt. Martin's belief that as a Desk Officer he was not required to activate his BWC, this is contradictory to the NYPD Patrol Guide detailing BWC protocol. Lt. Martin did not activate his BWC before exiting the stationhouse and effecting the arrest of § 87(2)(b) nor did he do so when § 87(2)(b) requested inside the stationhouse, failing twice to adhere to NYPD procedure on the matter.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Frank Schimmenti failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

§ 87(2)(b) was processed for arrest and placed into a holding cell. Approximately ninety minutes later, PO Schimmenti removed § 87(2)(b) from the holding cell and walked him back to the Desk where Lt. Martin was standing. PO Schimmenti issued § 87(2)(b) a summons for trespassing. § 87(2)(b) asked why he was being issued a summons for trespassing when he was outside on the street and Lt. Martin told § 87(2)(b) that while § 87(2)(b) was outside filming on the street, Lt. Martin had directed him to leave the stationhouse area and to film from across the street. § 87(2)(b) told Lt. Martin that this explanation did not make sense. § 87(2)(b) requested PO Schimmenti's business card. PO Schimmenti did not provide § 87(2)(b) with his business card and told him that his information was on the summons that § 87(2)(b) was being issued, so he did not need to provide a card as well. § 87(2)(b) took his summons and left the stationhouse without further incident (Board Review 07).

PO Schimmenti's BWC video recording captures him processing § 87(2)(b) for release. At the 01:16 time stamp, § 87(2)(b) asks PO Schimmenti, "Can I have your business card?" PO Schimmenti responds, "My name is on the summons." PO Schimmenti does not provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card (Board Review 04).

§ 87(2)(b) summons for Trespass was prepared by PO Schimmenti. The summons includes PO Schimmenti's full name and tax number (Board Review 11).

NYC Administrative Code 14-174: RTKA in regards to identification of police officers, section b notes: during a law enforcement activity, an officer shall: Offer a business card to such person at the conclusion of any such activity that does not result in an arrest or summons. The Administrative Code goes on to note that notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision b, an officer shall offer a business card to any person requesting identifying information, or provide such information verbally to such person and allow such person sufficient time to record such information when such officer does not have an adequate number of pre-printed business cards or hand-written cards on his or her person at the time of such law enforcement activity (Board Review 17).

Per the above Administrative Code, even though PO Schimmenti issued a summons to § 87(2)(b) he was still required to provide a business card upon § 87(2)(b) request, but he failed to do so.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: An officer refused to provide their name to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: An officer refused to provide their shield number to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that before being released and while standing at the desk with PO Schimmenti, § 87(2)(b) requested the name and shield number of an unknown officer who was standing nearby. The officer refused to provide their name and shield because they were “not involved” in § 87(2)(b) arrest (Board Review 07).

PO Schimmenti’s BWC video captures § 87(2)(b) request a business card from PO Schimmenti, which PO Schimmenti declines to provide (beginning at the 01:16 time stamp). § 87(2)(b) asks, “So you’re denying me a business card? Internal affairs told me that it’s your policy” (at the 02:01 time stamp). PO Schimmenti replies, “We’re letting you leave with a summons, I don’t why you have to keep talking.” An unknown officer, who is off camera and cannot be seen, says, “Not when you’re arrested or issued a summons, you’re not given one.” § 87(2)(b) responds, “Okay, no problem.” § 87(2)(b) does not ask any officer for their name. § 87(2)(b) does not ask any officer for their shield number (Board Review 04).

BWC video from PO Schimmenti captures § 87(2)(b) release from the stationhouse in its totality. During the period in which § 87(2)(b) requests PO Schimmenti’s business card, § 87(2)(b) alleged he also requested the name and shield number of an additional officer standing nearby. BWC video disputes these allegations and finds that they did not occur. § 87(2)(b) did not request the name and shield number of any officer while he was being released from the 62nd Precinct Stationhouse.

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- PO Frank Schimmenti has been a member-of-service for four years and this is the first CCRB complaint to which PO Schimmenti has been a subject.
- Lt. Colbert Martin has been a member of service for 23 years and has been a subject in 10 CCRB complaints and 18 allegations, of which one was substantiated:
 - #201805008 involved a substantiated allegation of Abuse: Refusal to process civilian complaint against Lt. Martin. The Board recommended Command Discipline – A and the NYPD imposed No penalty. § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

